

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

SAMUEL ROGERS,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 16-10136

v.

Hon. John Corbett O'Meara

STATE OF MICHIGAN
CIRCUIT COURT,

Defendant.

**ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION TO PROCEED
IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND DISMISSING COMPLAINT**

Appearing pro se, Plaintiff Samuel Rogers filed a complaint on January 19, 2015, and an application to proceed without prepayment of fees. The court finds Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* to be facially sufficient and, therefore, grants Plaintiff's motion to proceed without prepayment of fees. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a); Gibson v. R.G. Smith Co., 915 F.2d 260, 262 (6th Cir. 1990).

Once a court grants a plaintiff permission to proceed *in forma pauperis*, it must review the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). The court "shall dismiss" the case if the court finds that it is "(i) frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). In

addition, “[i]f the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

Plaintiff complains that he has been ordered to provide child support for a child that is not his. This court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over domestic matters such as child support. “The Supreme Court has held that federal courts lack jurisdiction over questions of divorce, alimony, or child custody.” See Adkins v. Adkins, 2015 WL 6736187, at *2 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 4, 2015) (citing Ankenbrandt v. Richards, 504 U.S. 689, 703-07 (1992)). Moreover, this court lacks jurisdiction to review a state court order or judgment. See Rowe v. City of Detroit, 234 F.3d 1269, 2000 WL 1679474 (6th Cir. 2000) (“The *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine provides that federal district courts generally lack jurisdiction to review and determine the validity of state court judgments, even in the face of allegations that ‘the state court’s action was unconstitutional.’”).

Because Plaintiff’s complaint does not reveal a basis for federal subject matter jurisdiction, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that his complaint is DISMISSED.

s/John Corbett O’Meara
United States District Judge

Date: February 1, 2016

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties of record on this date, February 1, 2016, using the ECF system and/or ordinary mail.

s/William Barkholz
Case Manager